

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR THE

MID TERM REVIEW:

OF THE

SOUTH AFRICA HIV/AIDS RESPONSE FUND

Project Number: 033250

Program Name: South Africa

Canadian International Development Agency

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	RATIONALE, PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	2
1.1	RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	2
1.2	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	2
2	EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE.....	2
2.1	DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	2
2.2	RESPONSE FUND PROJECT PROFILE.....	3
2.3	KEY PARTNERS	4
2.4	LOGIC: EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT	4
3	EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS.....	5
3.1	EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	5
3.2	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	5
3.2.1	<i>Development Results</i>	5
3.2.2	<i>Quality of Partnership (based on Paris Declaration Principles)</i>	6
3.2.3	<i>Success Factors</i>	6
4	EVALUATION PROCESS	6
4.1	PREPARATION OF WORK PLAN.....	6
4.2	DATA COLLECTION	7
4.3	PREPARATION OF DRAFT AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORT	7
4.4	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE.....	8
5	ACCOUNTABILITIES & RESPONSIBILITIES.....	8
5.1	EVALUATION STEERING COMMITTEE	8
5.2	CIDA.....	8
5.3	RF PROJECT TEAM	9
5.4	CONSULTANTS	9
6	PROFILE OF CONSULTANTS	10
7	DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES, SCHEDULE	11
7.1	DELIVERABLES	11
7.2	MILESTONES	11
7.2.1	<i>Draft Work plan</i>	11
7.2.2	<i>Final Work plan</i>	11
7.2.3	<i>Debriefing/Validation sessions</i>	12
7.2.4	<i>Draft Evaluation Report</i>	12
7.2.5	<i>Final Evaluation Report</i>	12
7.3	SCHEDULE	12
8	LEVEL OF EFFORTS AND ESTIMATED BUDGET	13
8.1	LEVEL OF EFFORTS	13
8.2	ESTIMATED BUDGET	13
ANNEXES		
1.	EVALUATION WORK PLAN OUTLINE.....	14
2.	DESIGN MATRIX TEMPLATE.....	16

1.1 RATIONALE, PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The Canadian International Development Agency's (CIDA) Performance Review policy calls for periodic, independent evaluations of the Agency's investments. The identification of results contributes to informed decision-making, fosters organisational learning, and promotes greater accountability and transparency.

The South Africa HIV/AIDS Response Fund (RF) will be evaluated to assess whether the stated results are being achieved. The value added from this evaluation will result from sharing what is learned so far from this investment, and the development of more efficient and effective implementation of the project for the remaining period.

1.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The objectives of the mid-term review are to;

- Verify progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and expected results at different levels.
- Identify strength, weaknesses, constraints, lessons and opportunities arising from the implementation of the RF and various sub-projects.
- Make recommendations on future of the RF (e.g. cost/no cost extension, development of new projects).

2.0 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE

2.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

South Africa has one of the highest prevalence rates of HIV in the world at 17.8% (down from 18.8% in 2006) of the adult population, and an estimated 5.6 million South Africans living with HIV in 2009. According to the UNAIDS Global Report (2009), there are indications that HIV incidence has slowed down. In 2006 it was estimated that there were 530,000 new infections (approximately 1,400 new infections per day¹) but recent reports estimate a reduction to 365,000 or 1,000 new infections per day².

However, the burden of disease linked to HIV and AIDS still poses a huge health and developmental challenge to South Africa. For example, UNAIDS indicates that South Africa is one of the few countries in the world where child and maternal mortality have risen since the 1990s. Moreover, AIDS is the largest cause of maternal mortality in the country and also accounts for 35% of deaths of children under the age of five years³. TB has emerged as the leading cause of death among people living with AIDS in South Africa where the co-infection rate which stands at 73%.⁴

The South African Government's response to the HIV challenge was to come up with the HIV/AIDS National Strategic Plan for the period 2007-2011 (NSP) which was launched in April 2007. This was a comprehensive strategy based on a partnership of all sectors of society, because HIV and AIDS present a challenge for all. The NSP had two main objectives; (1) to

¹ Dorrington et al. 2006. The demographic impact of HIV/AIDS in South Africa. National and provincial indicators for 2006.

² SANAC, May 2011, South Africa: HIV epidemic, Response and Policy Synthesis

³ UNAIDS, 2010. Global Report: UNAIDS Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic

⁴ Dr. Aaron Motosoledi, 2011, "Universal Access - Treatment and Prevention Scale-up: The South African experience". Speech at XVIII International AIDS Conference, 20 July 2011, Vienna, Austria.

reduce the number of new infections by half, and (2) to provide comprehensive treatment, care and support to 80% of those who need it.

2.2 SOUTH AFRICA HIV/AIDS RESPONSE FUND PROJECT PROFILE

The South Africa HIV/AIDS Response Fund (RF) is a follow-on to, and is modeled along the lines of another preceding Fund, the Rapid Response Fund (RRF). The RRF was a C\$5 million Fund established by CIDA in 2004 to provide strategic funding opportunities to South African civil society organizations that complemented other ongoing and planned initiatives for the implementation of the South African HIV/AIDS/STD Strategic Plan 2000-2005. The RRF ended in 2008. Like the current RF, the RRF was based on a responsive model and focused on “rapid” responses to applications and approving proposals submitted by relevant partners.

The Response Fund has a budget of C\$12,000,000 over a period of five years from 2008 to 2013 to improve the health and quality of life of women and men, girls and boys, families and communities infected with, and affected by, HIV and AIDS. The Fund provides targeted support to South African civil society organizations to address HIV and AIDS in a gender responsive manner based on human rights principles and consistent with the Government of South Africa’s *HIV and AIDS Strategic Plan for 2007-2011*.

The Fund has two categories of sub-projects: 1) those valued up to \$100,000 over one to two years, to be implemented by well-established partners who want to introduce innovative approaches in the fight against HIV/AIDS; and 2) those valued up to \$500,000 over two to four years, which address HIV/AIDS prevention, care and support services and are implemented by partners able to demonstrate an excellent track record in the provision of such services.

The **goal** of the South Africa HIV/AIDS Response Fund (RF) is to contribute to the reduction of HIV/AIDS incidence and prevalence, and its impact in South Africa, through a human rights and gender equality based approach to HIV/AIDS prevention, care and support. The **purpose** of the project is to provide targeted support to South African civil society organizations to address HIV/AIDS in a gender responsive and human rights based manner, in line with the HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan for South Africa 2007-2011.

2.3 IMPLEMENTING ORGANISATION AND KEY PARTNERS

The PSU provides services to the Response Fund on a cost-recovery basis including, among other things, office space for the Fund Manager, the Assistant Fund Manager, the Gender Equality, HIV and AIDS and Results Based Management Specialists; communication tools and services; computers; accounting and financial management services.

The selection of sub-projects is administered by a Selection Committee chaired by the Project Team Leader (PTL) and comprising the Head of Development Cooperation (Counselor – Development) and includes the Gender Equality Specialist(s), the RBM Specialist and the Fund Manager (FM) with the latter acting as a non-voting member.

2.3.1 KEY PARTNERS

The Fund currently supports the work of 22 community based organizations across six (6) provinces- the Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo, Mpumalanga and North West- with an estimated combined budget of \$10,200,000. A list of sub-projects supported by the Fund will be provided as part of the literature to be reviewed.

2.4 LOGIC: EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE RF

The **ultimate objective** of the project is improved health and quality of life of women and men, girls and boys, families and communities affected by and infected with HIV in targeted areas.

The **expected intermediate outcomes** of the project are:

1. Strengthened capacity of Civil Society organisations (CSO) partners to provide gender responsive HIV and AIDS services for individuals, families and communities infected with and affected by HIV and AIDS;
2. Strategic and more equitable access to quality HIV and AIDS services by CSO partners for women, men, boys and girls; and,
3. Improved collaboration and coordination between CSO partners and with government structures and other relevant stakeholders.

The Fund aims to achieve the following **immediate outcomes**:

1. Improved project management capacity of partners;
2. Improved capacity of partners for gender responsive HIV and AIDS prevention and care programming;
3. Increased commitment of partners to gender responsive HIV and AIDS services;
4. Enhanced commitment by partners to community participation in HIV and AIDS services provision;
5. Increased ability to provide innovative responses to HIV and AIDS;
6. Increased awareness by partners of the importance of working collaboratively with government in the provision of integrated services; and,
7. Increased knowledge and skills sharing among partners.

The **expected outputs** of the project are:

- 1.1 Capacity building in Results-Based Management (RBM) provided to supported organizations.
- 1.2. Gender equality technical capacity support provided to supported organisations.
- 1.3. HIV and AIDS technical capacity support provided to supported organizations.
- 2.1 Partners identified and selected on the basis of their capacity and commitment to providing equitable access to gender responsive HIV and AIDS services
- 2.2. Partners identified and selected on the basis of their capacity and commitment to providing sustainable, community driven HIV and AIDS services;
- 2.3. Partners identified and selected based on their level of innovation in providing HIV and AIDS services.
- 3.1 Tools and systems that promote partner and government collaboration developed
- 3.2 Organisational learning spaces and opportunities created.

The Fund integrates gender equality, environment, human rights and capacity building as cross-cutting themes in the implementation of the project.

3.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The mid-term review will be guided by the following criteria:

A. Development results

1. Achievement of results
2. Effectiveness of results
3. Relevance of results
4. Sustainability of results

B. Quality of partnership⁵

1. Local ownership, Harmonisation and Alignment
2. Shared Accountability

C. Success factors

1. Appropriateness of design
2. Appropriateness of resource utilisation
3. Informed and timely action

In addition to being guided by the above framework, the consultants will also identify lessons learned, and provide recommendations for guiding future project initiatives. Finally, the evaluation will also assess factors related to cross-cutting themes of gender equality and environmental sustainability.

3.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In assessing progress, the consultants will seek to answer the following questions:

3.2.1 DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

3.2.1.1 Achievement of results: Is progress being made toward the achievement of results (including gender specific results) at the immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcome levels? Has the investment achieved results in: (1) advancing equal participation between men and women as decision makers, (2) Promoting the rights of women and girls, and (3) increasing women's access to and control over development resources and benefits? Are there any unintended results?

3.2.1.2 Cost-effectiveness of results: Is the relationship between costs and results reasonable? Do actual expenditures correspond to planned expenditures? Are significant variances fully justified?

3.2.1.3 Relevance of results: Does the purpose of the Fund remain valid and pertinent? Is it consistent with needs and priorities of targeted beneficiaries?

3.2.1.4 Sustainability of results: are the results achieved to date by partner organisations likely to be sustainable, i.e., for the duration and beyond completion of the project? Is there local ownership of project activities, with commitment for results and methods chosen to achieve them?

⁵ This is in line with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) principles.

3.2.2 Quality of partnership

3.2.2.1 Local Ownership, Harmonisation and Alignment: Does the development approach address locally assessed needs and are local stakeholders fully committed and supportive of the project? Was the project planning and design inclusive of local stakeholder needs? Does the development approach align with local systems and practices and does not operate in parallel to existing initiatives?

3.2.2.2 Shared Accountability of Results: Is there a shared responsibility and accountability for results? Is the partnership between CIDA and the partner organisations effective and efficient? Is there active participation of local recipients and beneficiaries (including women) in sub-project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation?

3.2.3 Success Factors

3.2.3.1 Appropriateness of resource utilisation: Are suitable human, financial and physical assets available and appropriately used? Is financial information complete, accurate, and reliable? What are the weaknesses and strengths of the Fund vis-à-vis how it is managed (decentralised, responsive etc.)?

3.2.3.2 Appropriateness of design: Was the Fund design appropriately and based on a sound understanding of the local context? Is the RF the appropriate mechanism to financially support South African HIV and AIDS NGOs and CBOs?

3.2.3.3 Cross-cutting themes: To what extent are cross-cutting themes of gender equality and environmental sustainability integrated into project design, plans, and management, monitoring and reporting?

3.2.3.4 Informed and timely Action: Does the RF respond to risks and take appropriate actions? Are there systems in place to monitor report and manage project risks?

4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

These terms of reference are guided by the *CIDA Evaluation Guide*, October 2004 and evaluation best practices. CIDA representatives will be involved throughout the evaluation and consulted at important milestones during the process. All logistical decisions will be made in consultation with CIDA representatives. Early on, consultants will clarify commitments, responsibilities and expectations of CIDA. CIDA will be given an opportunity to comment on the draft work plan and draft findings before they are put in final form for the report. CIDA will approve the evaluation work plan and the final report.

4.1 PREPARATION OF A WORK PLAN

The Consultant(s) will prepare a work plan that will operationalize and direct the evaluation. The work plan will refine and elaborate on the information presented in these ToRs to bring greater precision to the planning and design of the evaluation. It shall be based on a preliminary review of the documentation, discussions with key stakeholders, literature review, etc. The work plan shall follow the outline provided at Annex 1.

The work plan will describe how the evaluation will be carried out, bring in refinements, specify and elaborate to the terms of reference to bring greater precision and refinement to the

evaluation. The work plan will be approved by CIDA's Head of Development Cooperation and act as the agreement between parties for how the evaluation will be conducted.

The methodology section will describe and explain the evaluation method and processes and discuss how they will ensure the reliability and validity of findings. It will detail the methods and techniques used for data and information collection and processing. The choices (tools and methods) are justified and potential limitations and shortcomings are explained (limitations must be identified and appropriately mitigated). A solid narrative explanation is required in the methodology section. The Consultant will also provide an Evaluation Matrix that must follow the template provided in Annex 2. Note: it is not sufficient to only refer to the evaluation matrix (that must be attached in the appendix).

Finally, the work plan will propose a solid Sampling framework (purpose, universe, sampling criteria, proposed sample and sample analysis). Note: stakeholder participation is fundamental to CIDA evaluations. Stakeholder consultation is to be an integral component of evaluation planning; information collection; the development of findings; evaluation reporting; and results dissemination. The work plan shall indicate the stakeholders to be consulted, the criteria for their selection. If less than the full range of stakeholders is not to be consulted, the methods and reasons for selection of particular stakeholders shall be described.

4.2 DATA COLLECTION

Data collection will be executed according to the approved (by CIDA) work plan which includes the evaluation matrix along with the sampling framework (i.e. the approved sample) identifying clearly sites/sub-projects to be documented (using methods defined in work plan), data to be collected by which stakeholders, documents to be gathered, etc. Where applicable, site visits should be carried out in collaboration with CIDA personnel.

The site visits are expected to be no longer than 15 days in duration. CIDA field personnel are to be briefed by the Consultant on arrival and preliminary data shall be presented to stakeholders for validation two days before departure from the field.

Stakeholder participation is fundamental to this assessment. The evaluation will provide for active and meaningful involvement of key stakeholders as appropriate. Evaluators will disseminate findings with local country partners to build capacity and improve mutual accountability.

4.3 PREPARATION OF DRAFT AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

The Consultant(s) will prepare an evaluation report that describes the evaluation and puts forward findings, results and lessons learned. The Consultants are entirely responsible for the quality of the final report and shall follow *OECD-DAC 2010 Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*⁶. The lead consultant shall be responsible for accurately representing and consolidating the inputs of the team members, stakeholders and CIDA field staff in the final report.

Note: as per the OECD DAC Standards, "Relevant stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on the draft report. The final evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can be verified, the evaluators investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or

⁶ CIDA wishes to remind the Consultant of its legal obligations with regard to the *OECD-DAC (2010) Evaluation Quality Standards*. The latter are an integral part of the present contract through the Standing Offer Agreement they signed.

interpretation, stakeholders' comments are reproduced verbatim, in an annex or footnote, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants.”

4.4 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Both CIDA and RF project team will prepare a joint management response to the evaluation report that documents their response to the recommendations and establishes how each organization will (or will not) follow-up on the recommendations. The Consultants are not expected to play any role on this part of the process.

5.0 ACCOUNTABILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1 Evaluation and Steering Committee

The evaluation will be a cooperative initiative guided collaboratively by an Evaluation Steering Committee, comprised of representatives from CIDA, the Program Support Unit (PSU) and the RF Project team. Meetings will take place at important milestones during the evaluation process and will be conducted in person, via teleconference (coordinated by CIDA) or through e-mail copied to all.

The Coordinating Committee's responsibilities include:

- Validation of the evaluation work plan, its scope, objectives, proposed management structure, suggested timeline, and the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders;
- Approval of the work plan submitted by consultants (the proposed research methodology, the information gathering techniques used and the suggested target dates);
- Identification of projects to be evaluated in the field;
- Act as resource persons for the evaluators (to facilitate access to documentation, and so on);
- Review and commenting on analyses and reports submitted by the evaluators (that is, progress reports, preliminary reports and the final report), and;
- Review and approval of an action plan based on the recommendations presented in the final evaluation report.

The committee will be comprised of representatives of CIDA as follows:

- CIDA Head of Development Cooperation, who will Chair the Committee
- CIDA Senior Development Officer, PTL for the Response Fund
- CIDA Junior Analyst on the South Africa programme.
- PSU Director

Where necessary, with the prior consent of the committee members, the committee may include other representatives from organisations linked to the project.

5.2 CIDA

The RF PTL will oversee the evaluation and be responsible for accountability and guidance throughout all phases of execution, and approval of all deliverables. He will be responsible for:

- Preparing the Terms of Reference in consultation with the Senior Analyst and RF PTL at CIDA HQ
- Notifying partners of the launch of the evaluation exercise
- Launching and coordinating the evaluator selection and contracting process;
- Engaging and managing the contract of the Consultants,
- Acting as the main contact person for the Consultants,
- Ensuring the coordination of the evaluation process,
- Providing guidance throughout all phases of execution, approve all deliverables and facilitate access to any documentation (or any person) deemed relevant to the evaluation process
- Sharing deliverables with the geographic programs at CIDA HQ, and relevant CIDA officers in the field, as well as CIDA's Evaluation Directorate of Strategic Policy & Performance Branch for knowledge sharing and dissemination purposes.
- Performing quality control, in collaboration with sector and thematic specialists as required, of all deliverables.

5.3 RF Project Team

Overall the RF team (Fund Manager, Assistant Fund Manager and Specialists) will provide necessary support to ensure successful collection of information for the evaluation. The RF Project Team's responsibility will include:

- Providing comment/feedback to validating the evaluation mandate, especially its scope, objectives, proposed management structure, suggested timeline, and the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders,
- Providing assistance with names and contact details of people that have been selected for interviews during field visits;
- To act as resource persons for the consultants (to facilitate access to documentation, to plan travel itineraries or interviews in the field),
- To review and comment on analyses and reports submitted by the consultants; and
- Preparing a management response and action/implementation plan for the recommendations of the evaluation.

5.4 Consultants

To facilitate the collection, collation, interpretation and presentation of the information acquired as a result of this evaluation, two Consultants will be selected to undertake the mandate. The mandate requires two sets of skills, that is monitoring and evaluation as well as gender equality expertise. The monitoring and evaluation expert shall be the team leader. The consultants will report to the CIDA PTL who shall be the evaluation manager. The Head of Development Cooperation will have final approval authority.

5.4.1 In general, the **Lead Evaluator / Team Leader** will take overall responsibility for:

- Taking full knowledge of the *OECD-DAC (2010) Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf>
- Reviewing and commenting on the Terms of Reference
- Preparing and presenting the evaluation Work Plan;

- Conducting the evaluation according to the approved work plan;
- The day-to-day management of operations; including building a schedule and setting up meeting with relevant individuals from sampled organisations;
- Collecting credible, valid information, (i.e. cross-validates and critically assesses the information sources used and the validity of the data using a variety of methods and sources of information) following the work plan.
- Conducting wrap-up meetings (presentation of preliminary findings and validation) with all stakeholders, identified by CIDA.
- Regular progress reporting to CIDA PTL;
- The development of findings (disaggregated by gender as much as possible), conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned;
- The production of deliverables in accordance with contractual requirements and following *OECD-DAC 2010 Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*;
- Be a team player who will be responsible for the component(s) of the assignment which are assigned to him/her. These assignments will be defined in the work plan.

5.4.2 Gender Equality Specialist / Associate Evaluator

- Be a team member and will be responsible for the components of the assignment which are assigned to him/her by the team leader. These assignments will be defined in the work plan.
- Assessing the extent to which gender equality is integrated into project design, plans, and management, monitoring and reporting.
- Collecting credible and valid gender specific information for the evaluation.
- Drawing up gender specific lessons learned and recommendations to feed into the main report

6. PROFILE OF CONSULTANTS

The evaluation will be undertaken by two South Africa-based consultants. The selection of preferred service providers will be undertaken through an advertisement in a reputable newspaper, web portals and the PSU consultants' database. Both must be Evaluators at senior level with over 10 years of experience of which at least 5 years is in evaluation. The individuals must have substantial developing country experience preferably in South Africa or Southern Africa and a demonstrated ability to conceptualize the overall approach to work assignments and to plan, manage and lead complex evaluations.

The lead consultant must have demonstrated experience of supervising day-to-day activities of multi-disciplinary evaluation teams of experts. He/she must be able to: (a) develop appropriate evaluation tools/methods, (b) ensure the accuracy, adequacy and reliability of the evaluation findings and recommendations, (c) make recommendations to senior government officials, (d) produce analytical reports, and (e) recommend appropriate CIDA action.

In addition, the **Lead Evaluator / Team Leader** will also have the following experience/knowledge/competence:

- A post graduate degree in a related field
- Previous experience with the type of evaluation mandate considered in the present TORs
- Sectoral expertise and experience on health and HIV and AIDS issues preferably in South Africa and/or the Southern Africa context;
- Demonstrated familiarity with donor project design, planning, management, reporting procedures and requirements;
- Sound knowledge and experience in evaluating/assessing donor-funded projects;
- Experience in conducting participatory evaluations;
- Experience in working with civil society from small local CBOs to national NGOs;
- Fluent in English. Understanding of South African local languages will be an added advantage

The **Gender Equality Specialist and Associate Evaluator** must have the following experience/knowledge/competence:

- A post graduate degree in a related field
- More than 5 years' experience of which half is in evaluation that includes gender specific issues related health and HIV and AIDS preferably in South Africa and/or the Southern Africa context;
- Capability to undertake field assignments alone or as a member of a team; meet project management teams, produce gendered analytical reports and recommend appropriate action;
- Experience and knowledge of assessing gender equality as a cross cutting issue in development;
- Sound knowledge and experience in evaluating/assessing donor-funded projects;
- Experience working with civil society from small local CBOs to national NGOs
- Fluent in English. Understanding of South African local languages will be an added advantage

All CVs received will be included in the PSU consultants' roster and may be selected for similar assignments in future.

7.0 DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES, SCHEDULE

7.1 DELIVERABLES

The Consultants will;

1. Prepare a draft work plan following the outline provided in Annex 2, to be revised by CIDA
2. Provide a Final work plan to be approved by CIDA Head of Development Cooperation.
3. Provide a debrief/validation workshop to present preliminary data to stakeholders (e.g.: locally engaged CIDA field staff, the Fund Manager and developing country counterparts) for discussion/validation.
4. Prepare a draft evaluation report (in conformity the *OECD-DAC 2010 Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*), to be reviewed by CIDA. .
5. Provide a Final Report to be approved by CIDA.

These deliverables are to be prepared in English, and submitted in both hard copy and electronic formats to CIDA to the Evaluation Manager.

7.2 Milestones

7.2.1 Draft Work Plan

The Consultants will submit a draft work plan to the CIDA Head of Development Cooperation and CIDA Senior Development Officer within three weeks of the signing of the contract. The Consultants shall follow the proposed outline (see Annex 1).

7.2.2 Final Work Plan

Within one week of receiving comments, the Consultant(s) will produce a final work plan to be approved by CIDA.

7.2.3 Debriefing/Validation sessions

Perform a debrief/validation workshop after site visits.

7.2.4 Draft Evaluation Report

The Consultants is to submit a draft Evaluation report to the Head of Development Cooperation and the CIDA Senior Development Officer for review within three weeks of returning from site visits.

7.2.5 Final Evaluation Report

Within one week of receiving comments, the Consultant(s) will submit a final evaluation report (including an executive summary). Note: CIDA will add to the Report, before publication, the Management Responses and Stakeholders' comments (if applicable).

7.3 Schedule

This evaluation is expected to be completed by 11 May 2012. The final evaluation report must be submitted to CIDA on or before 4 May 2012. The timeline below identifies the key phases of the evaluation and provides suggested target dates for the completion of each phase:

Table 1: Preliminary Schedule

What	When
Preliminary document analysis and consultations	13 February
Submission of draft work plan for revision	24 February March
Submission of final work plan for approval by CIDA	29 February
Data collection - site visits	16 March
Evaluation debriefing and validation	3 April
Submission of preliminary report for review	24 April
Stakeholders' comments	30 April
Submission of final report for approbation by CIDA	4 May
Complete Final report with Management responses (and item 8)	11 May

The selected Consultants must specify in the work plan when each activity will start and end, using the above timeline as an indicative guideline. Once validated by the coordinating committee, the work plan and the timeline included therein will constitute the key reference document for tracking the progress of this evaluation.

8.0 LEVEL OF EFFORT AND ESTIMATED BUDGET

The basis for payment and payment scheduling will be determined during contract negotiations.

8.1 Level of Efforts

CIDA's projections for the 'level of effort' required for this evaluation and the anticipated 'consultants-related costs' for carrying out this project are set out below:

Table 1: Projected level of effort (LOE)

Tasks	LOE (days)	
	T. Leader	Specialist
A) Document analysis and consultation with CIDA	5	5
B) Draft Work plan preparation	5	5
C) Revision and final Work plan revision	2	2
D) Data collection and analysis	12	8
E) Debriefing, analysis, Report preparation,	12	8
• Draft Evaluation Report	3	2
• Revision and Final Evaluation Report	2	2
F) Presentation workshop	1	1
Total	42	33

8.2 Estimated Budget

The estimate to complete the evaluation including all costs and GST is \$100,000⁷. The figure includes fees, travel and related expenses and incidentals for the consultants. This is a figure that includes all fees, travel, expenses and incidentals. The basis and schedule of payment will be determined during contract negotiations.

⁷ The RF approved budget sets aside \$30,000 which is insufficient for the purpose.

Annex 1: EVALUATION WORK PLAN OUTLINE

1. Rationale, purpose and specific objectives of the evaluation

2. Evaluation Object and Scope

2.1. Project description

2.2. Intervention logic

3. Preliminary issues and potential impact on evaluation (evaluability)

3.1. Findings and recommendations from previous and/or other evaluations (if applicable)

3.2. Evaluability assessment

- Review of the coherence and logic of a intervention;
- Review of the evaluation questions.
- Clarification of data availability and quality and of key informants availability;
- Level of resistance to evaluation and its reasons;
- Factors that may compromise the independence of the evaluation;
- Address possible conflicts of interest

4. Evaluation Criteria and key questions

(Criteria and updated questions)

5. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

5.1. Evaluation Approach

5.2. Evaluation Methodology (taking into consideration budget, time, data and political constraints)

- specification and justification of the proposed design
- specification and justification of the proposed techniques for data collection;
- specification of proposed the data sources;
- specification and justification of the proposed data analysis;
- narrative explanation the evaluation matrix (the Matrix is to be include as an Annexe)

1.3. Sampling

For each sampling (e.g. stakeholders selection, sites selection, etc.) specify: Purpose, Universe, Sampling criteria, Proposed sample, Sample analysis (i.e. limitations).

6. Reporting

6.1. Debriefing-validation and draft rapport (how it will be done)

6.2. Table of content of the final report

7. Evaluation Management

7.1. Evaluation Team Members

7.2. Roles and Responsibilities

7.3. Risks and risk Mitigation

8. Key Deliverables, Timelines and Resources

8.1. Deliverables and Milestones, Schedule

8.2. Level of Effort and budget (update if necessary)

Annexes

- Evaluation Matrix
- Sampling Framework
- Bibliography (used for the work plan design)
- List of individuals (consulted for the work plan design).
- LFA or PMF
- ToRs

Annex 1: Design matrix template

Question	Subquestion	Type of subquestion	Measure or indicator	Target or standard (normative)	Baseline data?	Data source	Design	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis	Comments

Source: Morra-Imas, Linda G. And Ray C. Rist. (2009) The Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations, World Bank, Washington D.C., pp.243.

